arXiv:0910.3674v2 [hep-th] 24 Jun 2010

Perturbative and Non-perturbative $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity

Massimo Bianchi[1,2], **Sergio Ferrara**[1,3,4], and **Renata Kallosh**[5]

[1]*Physics Department, Theory Unit, CERN CH 1211, Geneva 23,*
Switzerland [2]*Dipartimento di Fisica and Sezione INFN,*
Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", Via della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133 Roma,
Italy [3]*INFN - Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Via Enrico Fermi 40, 00044 Frascati,*
Italy [4]*Department of Physics and Astronomy University of California, Los Angeles,*
CA USA [5]*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305*

We study extremal black holes, their ADM mass and area of the horizon in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. Contrary to intuition gained from $\mathcal{N} = 2, 3, 4$ theories, in $\mathcal{N} = 8$, as well as in $\mathcal{N} = 5, 6$, supergravity BPS states may become massless only at the boundary of moduli space. We show that stringy states described in [1], which have no mass gap and survive in toroidal compactifications in addition to the massless states of perturbative $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, display a null singularity in four-dimensional space-time, when viewed as solutions of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ version of Einstein equations. We analyze known methods of resolving such singularities and explain why they all fail in $D = 4$, $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. We discuss possible implications for the issue of UV finiteness of perturbative $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity and the plausibility of a non-perturbative completion that exclude singular states.

Introduction – $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity [2] is the theory with the largest possible amount of supersymmetry for particles with spin $s \leq 2$ in $D = 4$. The perturbative theory has recently shown surprisingly good UV properties [3]. In particular, at three loops the expected UV divergent R^4 term [4] is absent, which could have broken the continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry to a discrete subgroup [5] in combination with instanton effects. Not even at four loops the theory produces any divergence [3]. Similarly to $\mathcal{N} = 5, 6$ supergravities and contrary to other extended supergravity theories with $\mathcal{N} < 5$, $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry is not anomalous [6]. As for the $SL(2, R$ symmetry of Type IIB superstrings in $D = 10$ [7], the continuous symmetry is believed to be broken down to discrete $E(7, 7; Z)$ by non-perturbative effects like instantons [8] and by Dirac-Schwinger-Zwanziger charge quantization for regular black holes. The breaking of $E(7, 7; R)$ to $E(7, 7; Z)$ is instrumental to setting a uniform mass-gap, given by Planck Mass $M_{Pl} = \sqrt{\hbar c/G_N} = 1.22 \times 10^{19} GeV/c^2$, everywhere inside the moduli space $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$, for all regular BPS states with $\mathcal{I}_4 \neq 0$ where [9]

$$\mathcal{I}_4 = q^{abcd} \mathcal{Q}_a \mathcal{Q}_b \mathcal{Q}_c \mathcal{Q}_d \tag{1}$$

is the quartic Cartan invariant of $E_{7(7)}$ [2] and $\mathcal{Q}_a$ is a 56-dimensional vector of 'bare' quantized[1] electric and magnetic charges with respect to the 28 $U(1)$ gauge groups.

$\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity can be derived by dimensional reduction of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in $D = 11$ on a 7-torus T^7 or of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity in $D = 10$ on a 6-torus T^6. In such a process an infinite number of states which would be massive in $D = 4$ are eliminated from the theory. After taking into account charge quantization and assuming that the perturbative theory be UV finite to all orders, we would like to propose the *plausibility of a non-perturbative completion of genuinely 4-dimensional* $\mathcal{N} = 8$ *supergravity, that only include regular BH states with* $\mathcal{I}_4 \neq 0$ *and exclude all singular states with* $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$.

Our proposal has some analogy with the story for pure $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in $D = 4$, decoupled from gravity and other stringy interactions. Even after including non-perturbative effects, $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in $D = 4$ should not be thought of as a compactification of Type I or Heterotic strings, that contain the same massless states but differ by the massive completion, but rather in terms of the AdS/CFT correspondence [10]. Pure 4-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, including regular non-perturbative states, may be disconnected from toroidal compactifications of Type II superstrings, that unavoidably give rise to 1/2 BPS states with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$. The fact that all known $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity perturbative amplitudes could be expressed in terms of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM amplitudes in the superconformal phase, where the latter enjoys 32 supersymmetries, 16 of Poincaré type and 16 superconformal, might be more than an analogy in this respect.

The conjectured UV finiteness of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, associated with continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry, has been questioned by Green, Ooguri, Schwarz in [1], where non-decoupling of BPS states from four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity was discussed. The main conclusion of [1] was that the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity limit of string theory does not exist in four dimensions, irrespective of whether or not the perturbative approximation is free of UV divergences. String theory adds to the 256 massless states of four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity an infinite tower of states, such as Kaluza-Klein momenta and monopoles, wound strings and wrapped branes.

---

[1] Perturbative Feynman graphs would not show pathologies even in a non-anomalous but possibly chiral abelian theory with charges in irrational ratios. Charge quantization would however result from an embedding in a non-abelian theory.

Later on we will study these states as nearly massless extremal black hole solutions of non-perturbative four-dimensional $\mathcal{N}=8$ supergravity.

Classical solutions of the $\mathcal{N}=8$ version of non-linear Einstein equations include stable, zero temperature, extremal, BPS and non-BPS charged black holes [11]. For appropriate choices of the charges, these can be viewed as smooth solitons interpolating between flat Minkowski space-time at infinity and Bertotti-Robinson $AdS_2 \times S^2$ geometry near the horizon. The asymptotic values of the scalar fields are largely arbitrary and determine the ADM mass M for given charges $\mathcal{Q}_a$. Thanks to the attractor mechanism, their near-horizon values are determined in terms of the charges [12]. The entropy of a black hole in $\mathcal{N}=8$ supergravity is related to the horizon area by the Bekenstein-Hawking formula[2]

$$S_{BH} = \frac{1}{4} A_H = \pi \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4|}\ . \qquad (2)$$

$\mathcal{N}=8$ attractors were studied in [14].

The ADM mass of extremal black holes – The ADM mass of an $\mathcal{N}=8$ extremal black hole depends on its charges and on the asymptotic values of the scalar fields, both transforming under $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry: $M_{BH} = M_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi)$. A manifestly $E_{7(7)}$ covariant expression for the mass is related to the maximal eigenvalue of the central charge matrix [5],[15]

$$M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi) \geq \mathrm{Max}_i\{|Z_i(\mathcal{Q},\phi)|^2\} \qquad (3)$$

where $Z_i(\mathcal{Q},\phi), i=1,2,3,4$, are the four (skew) eigenvalues of the 'dressed' central charge matrix $Z_{AB}(\mathcal{Q},\phi) = \mathcal{Q}_a \mathcal{V}^a{}_{AB}(\phi)$ (with $\bar{Z}^{AB}(\mathcal{Q},\phi) = \mathcal{Q}_a \mathcal{V}^{a,AB}(\phi)$), while $\mathcal{Q}_a$ are the 'bare' quantized charges. The coset representative for $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$ can be taken to be of the form:

$$\mathcal{V}^{a,\hat{a}}(\phi) = \{\mathcal{V}^a{}_{AB}(\phi); \mathcal{V}^{a,AB}(\phi)\} \qquad (4)$$

with $a,\hat{a} = 1,...,56$ while $A,B = 1,...8$ so that $[AB]$ runs over the **28** and **28*** of $SU(8)$ [2]. The positive hermitian matrix $\mathcal{H}_A{}^B = Z_{AC}\bar{Z}^{BC}$ has four *real positive eigenvalues* $|Z_i(\mathcal{Q},\phi)|^2 = \lambda_i$, which can be put in decreasing order $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4$. The BPS condition requires that the ADM mass be exactly equal to the largest eigenvalue of the central charge matrix

$$M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi)_{BPS} = \mathrm{Max}_i\{|Z_i(\mathcal{Q},\phi)|^2\} \qquad (5)$$

Non-BPS extremal black holes have a mass which is strictly larger than the largest eigenvalue of the central charge matrix

$$M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi)_{non-BPS} > \mathrm{Max}_i\{|Z_i(\mathcal{Q},\phi)|^2\} \qquad (6)$$

In such a case the quartic invariant is strictly negative, the non-BPS extremal black hole geometry is regular and its mass is never zero, $\mathcal{I}_4 < 0$, $S^{non-BPS}_{BH} = \frac{1}{4}A_H = \pi\sqrt{-\mathcal{I}_4}$.

In terms of the central charge matrix, the quartic invariant in the area/entropy formula (1) reads

$$\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q},\phi) = Tr[(Z\bar{Z})^2] - \frac{1}{4}[Tr(Z\bar{Z})]^2 + 8RePf(Z) \qquad (7)$$

It is interesting that each $SU(8)$ invariant term in this expression depends on the moduli, but the total expression is moduli independent due to $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry.

The bounds on the ADM mass and horizon area for 1/8, 1/4, 1/2 BPS – The definition of the fraction of unbroken supersymmetry (1/8, 1/4, 1/2) on BPS solutions of $\mathcal{N}=8$ supergravity in terms of the properties of the eigenvalues of the central charge is based on the classification of the orbits of exceptional groups in [16]. Here we present the bounds on the moduli dependent ADM mass as well as the bounds on the horizon area:

1/8 BPS case: $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4 \geq 0$. This is consistent with a non-negative $\mathcal{I}_4 \geq 0$. The mass is constrained as follows

$$\frac{1}{8}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} < (M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi))_{1/8} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} \qquad (8)$$

1/4 BPS case: $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 > \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 \geq 0$. This is consistent with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{8}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} < (M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi))_{1/4} \leq \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} \qquad (9)$$

1/2 BPS case: $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 \geq 0$. This is consistent with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ and

$$(M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q},\phi))_{1/2} = \frac{1}{8}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} \qquad (10)$$

Thus, taking into account that $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}Z\bar{Z} = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$ is a *sum of positive terms*, in all cases above the ADM mass of BPS states can only vanish when

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, Z\bar{Z}(\mathcal{Q},\phi) \equiv \mathcal{Q}_a \mathcal{V}^a{}_{AB}(\phi)\, \mathcal{V}^{b,AB}(\phi)\mathcal{Q}_b \to 0 \qquad (11)$$

with $\mathcal{V}^{a,\hat{a}}(\phi)$ a coset representative (4). It is a 56×56 square matrix which is invertible at any point inside the $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$ moduli space [2]. Since the 56-charge vector $\mathcal{Q}_a$ must have some non-zero elements (for extremal black holes) *the mass may vanish only at the boundary of moduli space* [5]. At the boundary, by definition, the coset representative degenerates, the perturbative theory is not valid, it blows up. The boundary is at infinite distance from any interior point as it corresponds to some scalar fields with canonical kinetic terms $\sim (\partial\phi)^2$ going to infinity, $\phi \to \pm\infty$.

---

[2] In string theory, where the entropy is computed via degeneracy of states, formula (1) is believed to be valid only for large charges. It is believed that 1/2 BPS states have zero entropy even at the quantum level. For 1/4 BPS states the situation is still somewhat puzzling [13].

Consider states which are massive in the interior of moduli space and can become massless at the boundary.

All cases of M_{ADM} reaching zero at the boundary – Starting from a scalar (spherically symmetric) state, the maximum spin is: $J_{Max} = (\mathcal{N} - K)/2$, where $K/\mathcal{N}$ is the fraction of susy preserved, $J_{Max} = 2$, 3, 7/2, 4 respectively for 1/2 (ultrashort), 1/4 (short), 1/8 (minimally short) BPS and non-BPS (long) multiplets [17].

1/8 BPS case. In this case we have two classes of solutions.

a) The first class, with $\mathcal{I}_4 > 0$ and regular area of the horizon, has a mass gap which due to the attractor mechanism [12] defines the minimal value of the ADM mass via the one at the horizon

$$M^2_{ADM} \geq M^2_{hor} = \mathcal{I}_4 > 0 \qquad (12)$$

The bound is saturated for double-extreme black holes with constant scalars where $M^2_{ADM} = M^2_{hor} = \mathcal{I}_4 > 0$.

b) The second class of 1/8 BPS states, with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$, is somewhat special. In the interior of moduli space, the eigenvalues of the central charge matrix are different, $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4 \geq 0$ and the mass is non-zero. However, at the boundary the mass vanishes. The eigenvalues vanish at different rates: $\Delta\sqrt{\lambda}/\sqrt{\lambda} \neq 0$. Thus in the interior of moduli space, 1/8 BPS solutions have a non-vanishing ADM mass and form multiplets with maximal spin $J_{Max} = 7/2$ at least.

1/4 BPS case, $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ always. At the boundary of moduli space, the mass vanishes. The ratio $\Delta\sqrt{\lambda}/\sqrt{\lambda}$ depends on the way the boundary is approached. In some limit, both $\Delta\sqrt{\lambda}$ as well as $\sqrt{\lambda}$ vanish asymptotically. In some other limit, the ratio may not vanish. This seems to indicate that, even at the boundary, 1/4 BPS states behave differently from 1/2 BPS states, whose masses vanish faster towards the boundary. In any case, all 1/4 BPS solutions are singular, both massive and massless.

1/2 BPS case. In the interior of moduli space, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 > 0$, while $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$ at the boundary. This is only consistent with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$. As in the above cases, 1/2 BPS states are massive in the interior and massless at the boundary:

$$(M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q}, \phi \in \mathit{Interior}))_{1/2} = \lambda_i > 0 \qquad (13)$$

$$(M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q}, \phi \in \mathit{Boundary}))_{1/2} = \lambda_i = 0 \qquad (14)$$

All 1/2 BPS solutions are singular since the area of the horizon vanishes. Of all BPS solutions so far discussed, the infinite tower of 1/2 BPS states is most easily identified with the states described in [1]. They represent the K-K and string states obtained by compactification down to four dimensions in addition to the massless 256 states of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. When viewed as non-perturbative solution of Einstein equations they represent singular space-times: *For all solutions with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ the area of the horizon vanishes, even when the solutions are massive in the interior of moduli space.* Although the attractor mechanism does not work for singular solutions, the algebraic feature of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity that $\mathcal{I}_4$ is moduli independent gives us complete control on the situation. The emergence of massless higher spins at the boundary for 1/4 and 1/8 BPS multiplets with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ corresponds to multi-charge solitonic states with finite entropy in higher dimensions.

In comparing $D = 4$ $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity with string or M theory one should keep in mind that the 70 scalars of $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$ include on an equal footing all massless moduli which arise in dimensional reductions from higher dimension. From a superstring perspective, they also contain the string coupling g_s, so that the boundary of moduli space may encompass many limits of string theory, such as infinite string coupling, zero string tension, de-compactifications and others [18]. Moreover the ADM mass should be considered in the Einstein frame, where Newton's law holds, and not in the string frame. $E_{7(7)}$ invariance of the $D = 4$ space-time geometry is only manifest in the Einstein frame. In the string frame, the metric itself would transform and $M_s = g_s M_{Pl}$ would vary as g_s at fixed M_{Pl}.

Space-time geometry – Regular extremal black hole solutions have the following infinite throat geometry [11]:

$$ds^2 = -e^{2U(\tau)}dt^2 + e^{-2U(\tau)}\left(\frac{d\tau^2}{\tau^4} + \frac{1}{\tau^2}d^2\Omega\right) \qquad (15)$$

The ADM mass defines the behavior of the metric at asymptotic infinity in the space-time at $\tau \to 0$

$$U(\tau)_{\tau\to 0} = M_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q}, \phi_{r\to\infty})\,\tau \qquad (16)$$

Near the regular horizon at $\tau \to -\infty$, where the geometry approaches $AdS_2 \times S^2$, one finds

$$e^{-2U(\tau)}_{\tau\to-\infty} \to \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q})|}\,\tau^2 \qquad (17)$$

As it is clear from the metric, the area of the horizon equals $4\pi\sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q})|}$. The attractor mechanism in this case requires that $M^2_{ADM}(\mathcal{Q}, \phi_{r\to\infty}) \geq \sqrt{|\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q})|}$. Only for configurations with $\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$ the ADM mass may vanish: since the area is moduli independent, once the mass vanishes at the boundary, which requires $\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q}) = 0$, the area vanishes also for all massive solutions with the corresponding set of charges. *In all such cases the null surface of the horizon turns into a null singularity.*[3]

In order to consider including states with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ in the non-perturbative $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity spectrum, one should find a way to resolve their singularity in $D = 4$. The higher dimensional resolution of dilatonic black hole singularities is well understood [19]. However, the dilemma we face here is to study the issue directly in $D = 4$ in view of the possible UV finiteness of $N = 8$

---

[3] The singularity of the 1/2 BPS states in $D = 4$ space-time was not considered pathological because in the string frame the so-called $\sqrt{3}$ dilatonic black hole has a regular horizon. However physical ADM masses are defined in the Einstein frame, where such a black hole is singular.

supergravity. In higher dimensions maximal supergravity is expected to be perturbatively divergent at L loops when $D < 4+6/L$ is violated [3, 20], and to be consistent only as part of a more fundamental theory such as string or M- theory. Without invoking the latter, we can only rely on known methods in $D = 4$.

Resolution of singularity by non-extremality? One can try to regularize the singular solutions by small deviation from extremality[4]. A set of regular non-extremal charged black hole solution with non-vanishing area of the outer horizon are presented in eq.(23) of [21]. As one approaches the extremal limit along the "large orbit" [16] $\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q}) = 2|PQ| \neq 0$ where the area is regular, the non-extremal black holes have zero limiting temperature and remain regular. These are always massive. On the other hand, along the "small orbit" with $\mathcal{I}_4(\mathcal{Q}) = 2|PQ| = 0$, the Hawking temperature approaches a non-zero constant as shown in eqs. (64), (65) in [21]. Meanwhile, the so called $\sqrt{3}$ dilatonic black holes, which are regular only when non-extremal, in the limit to extremality have a diverging Hawking temperature [22]. The discontinuity and divergence of temperature in the extremal limit suggest the breakdown of the thermodynamic description. No alternative descriptions are known in $\mathcal{N} = 8$, as we show below.

Resolution of singularity by stretching the horizon? For Calabi-Yau compactifications of string theory with non-zero second Chern class, there are known quantum corrections which stretch the horizon area of "small black holes", for instance, in IIB string theory compactified on $K3 \times T^2$ [23]. In $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity there are no known quadratic or higher curvature corrections which would be able to stretch the horizon and remove the null singularity of nearly massless and massless "black holes". In fact if the theory were perturbatively UV finite no corrections whatsoever would appear to the lowest two-derivative action.

Resolution of singularity by the enhancon mechanism? The enhancon mechanism [24] is based on a special property of extended supergravities with $\mathcal{N} = 3, 4$. They admit matter vectors with their associated 'matter' central charges. The two-derivative action is completely fixed by the number of vector multiplets and the structure constants of the gauge algebra. The theory retains supersymmetry when the number of matter multiplets changes. Therefore supersymmetry does not prevent transitions from one version of the theory to another, with different number of matter multiplets. *In $\mathcal{N} < 5$ supergravities generically the matrix relating the central charges Z_{AB} to 'bare' charges $\mathcal{Q}_a$ is a rectangular rather than a square matrix, due to the presence of the matter multiplets* [15], [5]. *Therefore 1/2 BPS states can become massless in the interior of moduli space.* Typically, these points of enhanced gauge symmetry coincide with orbifold points which can be seen in perturbative string theory. This phenomenon is the basis of the so-called enhancon mechanism which resolves the singularity of repulson solutions in supergravity. An analogous phenomenon takes place in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theories where the number of matter multiplets can change at finite distance in moduli space [25], *i.e.* at points where a BPS state becomes massless due to quantum corrections to the prepotential of the form $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{N}=2}_{1-loop} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} Z^1 \log Z^1$.

The two derivative action of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity is unique and it describes one single supermultiplet (the same is also true for $\mathcal{N} = 5, 6$). As a result, *central charges are related to the 'bare' charges by a square invertible matrix, since $\mathcal{N} \geq 5$ supergravities do not admit matter multiplets. Therefore new massless BPS states cannot appear in the interior of moduli space and cannot support enhancon type transitions.* Thus, no enhancon resolution of singularities applies in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, viewed as a pure four-dimensional theory.

Since single-center states with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ are singular, irrespectively of any BPS condition, we expect that the lowest mass states in this sector be a BPS multi-center black hole, *i.e.* a bound state of regular BPS states with $\mathcal{I}_4 \neq 0$. The mass scale is set by the unique mass scale of theory, Planck mass, while the relative positions are constrained by the BPS condition in terms of the $E(7, 7)$ invariant pairings of the constituents' charges. Since singular single-center BH's with $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$ cannot be formed because of the weak cosmic censorship hypothesis, two or more regular BH's whose total charge gives $\mathcal{I}_4 = 0$, may only form a multi-center regular bound state rather than a single-center singular object.

We conclude with remarks on the conjectured UV finiteness of perturbative $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $D = 4$ supergravity [3] and massless string states described in [1]. If the perturbative theory has some, yet unknown UV divergences [26, 27], our analysis of the massless black hole solutions may require modifications. However, if there are no UV divergences in perturbation theory, we do not expect corrections to our analysis of the space-time properties of these states. Here we have shown that the states in [1] are singular. There are two logical possibilities. 1. These states may be consistently excluded from the four-dimensional theory and therefore do not affect UV properties of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ $D = 4$ supergravity 2. They can be proven to be required in $D = 4$ and affect the perturbative theory. Here we have given circumstantial evidence for the plausibility of the first option. Future investigations may shed further light on this.

We are grateful to T. Banks, Z. Bern, L. Dixon, M. Green, M. Gunaydin, G. Horowitz, A. Linde, D. Simic, S. Shenker, R. Stora, A. Strominger, L. Susskind and V. S. Varadarajan, for most stimulating discussions. This work was partially supported by the ERC Advanced Grant n.226455 *"Superfields"* and by the Italian MIUR-PRIN contract 2007-5ATT78 *"Symmetries of the Universe and of the Fundamental Interactions"*. The work

---

[4] This was suggested by G. Horowitz and S. Shenker.

of SF has been supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG03-91ER40662, Task C. The work of RK is supported by the NSF grant 0756174.

- [1] M. B. Green, H. Ooguri and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2007) 041601
- [2] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, Nucl. Phys. B **159**, 141 (1979). B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, Nucl. Phys. B **208** (1982) 323.
- [3] Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson and R. Roiban, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 081301 (2009) R. Kallosh, JHEP **0909**, 116 (2009) Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson, D. A. Kosower and R. Roiban, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 161303 (2007)
- [4] R. E. Kallosh, Phys. Lett. B **99** (1981) 122. P. S. Howe, K. S. Stelle and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **191**, 445 (1981).
- [5] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **438**, 109 (1995) C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **451**, 525 (1995)
- [6] N. Marcus, Phys. Lett. B **157** (1985) 383.
- [7] M. B. Green and P. Vanhove, Phys. Lett. B **408**, 122 (1997)
- [8] M. Bianchi, M. B. Green, S. Kovacs and G. Rossi, JHEP **9808**, 013 (1998)
- [9] R. Kallosh and B. Kol, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 5344 (1996)
- [10] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113 (1999)] [arXiv:hep-th/9711200].
- [11] S. Ferrara, G. W. Gibbons and R. Kallosh, Nucl. Phys. B **500** (1997) 75; T. Ortin, "Gravity And Strings," *Cambridge Unversity, Cambridge University Press, 2004*
- [12] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5412 (1995)
- [13] A. Sen, arXiv:0908.3402 [hep-th].
- [14] S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 125005 (2006)
- [15] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **444**, 92 (1995)
- [16] S. Ferrara and M. Gunaydin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **13** (1998) 2075 S. Ferrara and J. M. Maldacena, Class. Quant. Grav. **15** (1998) 749
- [17] S. Ferrara, C. A. Savoy and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. B **100**, 393 (1981).
- [18] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **443**, 85 (1995)
- [19] G. W. Gibbons, G. T. Horowitz and P. K. Townsend, Class. Quant. Grav. **12**, 297 (1995)
- [20] M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 131602 [arXiv:hep-th/0611273].
- [21] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, T. Ortin, A. W. Peet and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5278 (1992)
- [22] F. Dowker, J. P. Gauntlett, S. B. Giddings and G. T. Horowitz, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 2662 (1994)
- [23] A. Dabholkar, R. Kallosh and A. Maloney, JHEP **0412**, 059 (2004)
- [24] C. V. Johnson, A. W. Peet and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 086001 (2000)
- [25] A. Strominger, Nucl. Phys. B **451** (1995) 96 and private communication; T. Banks, talk at the workshop "Supergravity versus Superstring Theory in the Ultraviolet," August 2009.
- [26] M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, arXiv:1002.3805 [hep-th].
- [27] J. Bjornsson and M. B. Green, arXiv:1004.2692 [hep-th].